



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,340	01/31/2002	Michael Renn Neal	3919P012	1744
25928	7590	02/13/2006	EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER J. KULISH, ESQ HOLLAND & HART LLP P. O. BOX 8749 DENVER, CO 80201-8749			BLACKWELL, JAMES H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/062,340

Applicant(s)

NEAL ET AL.

Examiner

James H. Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 25-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 25-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to an amendment filed 11/21/2005 with an original priority date of **01/31/2002**.
2. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph have been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
4. Claims 1-11, and 25-47 remain pending. Claims 1, 25, 36, and 42 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-11, and 25-47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo et al. (hereinafter, Lo, U.S. Patent No. 6,523,040) in view of Bliss et al. (hereinafter Bliss, U.S. Patent No. 5,884,306), and in further view of Courter ("Mastering Microsoft Office 2000, Professional Addition", Copyright 04/1999, Sybex, pp. 1058-1062).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Lo teaches *displaying a list of items in an electronic catalog, each item corresponding to a row of the display, each row having values corresponding to attributes of the corresponding items arranged into attribute columns* (see Fig. 8).

Lo does not expressly teach that the table is used to display items in an *electronic catalog*. However, the use and display of tabular data was well known in the art at the time of invention as evidenced by numerous online e-commerce web sites such as eBay® and Amazon.com® and therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply such tables as described by Lo to display and manipulate electronic catalogs, providing the user the benefit of a customized display.

Lo also teaches *grouping some of the displayed items based on a selected attribute upon receiving a grouping command so that the grouped items are each displayed in a single row* (see Fig. 10).

Lo does not teach that *the grouping command is received after displaying the list of items*. However, Courter teaches an interactive Excel web page that includes a spreadsheet component with interactive features that can be modified by users after the page is published (Pgs. 1058-1062).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply such a spreadsheet container to have allowed a web user to interactively manipulate a table of information after said table was created and displayed on a web page. A benefit of displaying tabular data in this way would have allowed the user to interactively customize their output to assist in understanding the tabular content.

It would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Lo and Courter as both inventions relate to the display of tabular data. Adding the teaching of Courter provides the benefit of post-published interactivity of tabular data.

Lo also fails to specifically teach *expanding the grouped items upon receiving an expand command so that the grouped items are each displayed in a separate row*. However, Bliss teaches grouping of information based on a selection of a specific field (Col. 9, lines 32-34; Fig. 6). The grouped items can be ungrouped by clicking onto the header in the grouping box (70) using the mouse (29) and dragging the header out of

Art Unit: 2176

the grouping box (70). In Fig. 6, the group headings (102) indicate that the items are grouped by subject and that the subjects are Litigation, comprising two items, Patent, comprising five items, and TM (trademark), comprising four items. To display the actual items listed under each subject, the fields must be converted to an expanded view as shown in Fig. 7. Here, the subject groupings are seen in an expanded view, whereby the respective items for each subject can be viewed on the display screen. To display the items listed under each subject in the expanded view, the user moves the mouse (29) to any of the group headings (110), (112), and (114) that the user would like to display in the expanded view. The user then clicks the mouse (29) one time on the selected group heading. Once the group heading is selected, the field automatically converts to the expanded view. To return to the collapsed view, the user need only click the mouse (29) a second time on the selected group heading (Col. 9, lines 60-67; Col. 10, lines 1-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Lo and Bliss as both inventions relate to table manipulations. Adding the teaching of Bliss allows one to alternatively collapse and expand tables to examine different levels of detail. It is further noted that such an expansion could have also resulted in performing an "undo" in most interactive table applications known in the art at the time of invention.

Lo continues by teaching *removing a row corresponding to an item or to grouped items from the display upon receiving a row remove command* in that Lo's invention performs row reduction, where a resultant row represents a summary of two or more original rows. Namely, combinations of original rows are collapsed into single summary

Art Unit: 2176

rows (Col. 5, lines 47-64). It is noted that such features are also typical of most spreadsheet applications, and were therefore well known in the art at the time of invention.

Lo also teaches *removing a column corresponding to an attribute of the items from the display upon receiving a column remove command* in that Lo's invention performs column reduction in a number of ways. One method is to simply drop the column. Another method is to reduce the data type into a shorter format. For example, a salary of \$123,456 could be displayed as 123K. For a "heart disease", one can simply use an abbreviation of HD. Yet another method is to merge multiple columns into a single one. For example, one can combine a two columns Sex=F and Age=25 into a single column Sex/Age=F/25. For a three-column address, such as Street, City, and Zip Code, these can be merged into a single column with all the information combined (Col. 6, lines 5-15). Lo's invention invokes the various claimed *commands* through a table summarizer module (233) associated with compressing or reducing the row/column configuration in accordance with a set of predefined rules (i.e., meta-data), viewing device capabilities, and a user viewing preference rule set. The method generally involves row reduction based on partition rules followed by column reduction (Col. 8, lines 32-43). It is noted that such features are also typical of most spreadsheet applications, and were therefore well known in the art at the time of invention.

In regard to dependent Claim 2, Lo fails to specifically teach *sorting the items based on attribute values upon receiving a sort command for one of the displayed attributes*. However, Bliss teaches that the method of grouping the items by the selected field involves primarily three steps. The first step is to sort the items by the selected field. The items are then scanned for duplicate field groups. Once the duplicate field groups are determined, the duplicate field groups are eliminated to provide a discrete set of field groups (Col. 2, lines 3-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Lo and Bliss as both inventions relate to table manipulations. Adding the teaching of Bliss allows one to easily identify and remove duplicate entries.

In regard to dependent Claim 3, Lo teaches *restricting the displayed items to a range of values for one of the displayed attributes upon receiving a refinement command for one of the displayed attributes* in that if a column is of a numeric data type, the column value of the resultant row can be the average value, the *range of values*, or the maximum/minimum (Col. 5, lines 56-58; Figs. 8-10).

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Lo fails to explicitly teach *receiving a refinement command comprises receiving a selection of a value for the one of the displayed attributes*. However, Bliss teaches a Group By Box command is selected in step (404), in response to user-provided input. After the Group By Box command is selected, in step (406), a grouping box appears on the display screen. Next, a desired field for grouping items is selected in response to user-provided input in step (408) (Col. xx, lines xx-xx; Fig. 18). Thus, Bliss allows one to define how the grouping will occur by

Art Unit: 2176

inputting a field. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Lo and Bliss as both inventions relate to table manipulations. Adding the teaching of Bliss allows one to define groupings based on a field.

In regard to dependent Claim 5, Lo teaches *displaying a count of the grouped items in the corresponding single row* in that depending on the column data type (ASCII, Numeric, etc. . . .), the column value of the resultant row can contain, inter alia, the same value (if all the values in the original rows are the same), *or the same value plus a count (i.e., the number of value occurrences)*, NULL (indicating different values on the original rows), or a majority value (e.g., 8 of the 10 original values are the same) (Col. 5, lines 47-55).

In regard to dependent Claim 6, Claim 6 reflects the method of displaying a list of items in an electronic catalog as claimed in Claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent Claim 7, Lo teaches *grouping further ones of the displayed items including grouped items based on a second selected attribute upon receiving a second grouping command so that the further grouped items are displayed in a single row* in that Lo merges multiple columns into a single one. For example, one can combine a two columns Sex=F and Age=25 into a single column Sex/Age=F/25. For a three-column address, such as Street, City, and Zip Code, these can be merged into a single column with all the information combined (Col. 6, lines 5-15). Though Lo does not explicitly teach that this can be done multiple times, it would have been

Art Unit: 2176

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to conclude that if such an action can be performed once, it can be performed at least more than once, providing the benefit of narrowing the table to precisely what the consumer is looking for.

In regard to dependent Claim 8, Lo teaches *grouping comprises comparing the values for the selected attribute for at least two of the items and combining items that have the same value for the attribute into a single row* in that a resultant row represents a summary of two or more original rows. Namely, combinations of original rows are collapsed into single summary rows. Depending on the column data type (ASCII, Numeric, etc. . . .), the column value of the resultant row can contain, inter alia, *the same value (if all the values in the original rows are the same)* (Col. 5, lines 47-52).

In regard to dependent Claim 9, Lo teaches *grouping comprises comparing the values for the selected attribute for at least two of the items and combining items that have values for the attribute within a range into a single row* in that if a column is of a numeric data type, the column value of the resultant row can be the average value, the *range of values*, or the maximum/minimum (Col. 5, lines 56-58; Figs. 8-10).

In regard to dependent Claim 10, Lo teaches *removing all of the items from the display except for items of a selected category upon receiving a category command; and displaying item values for attributes related specifically to the selected category* in that if a column is of a certain well-defined hierarchical semantic data type, the column value of the resultant row can be the common ancestor in the domain hierarchy. For example, in the case of an automobile hierarchy, if "gasoline powered" cars at one

Art Unit: 2176

hierarchical level, are sub-grouped as "high-octane" and "low-octane" cars at a lower hierarchical level, then the resultant column value is represented simply as "gasoline powered" thereby removing the lower hierarchical distinction between high and low octane automobiles in the resultant row (Col. 5, lines 61-67; Col. 6, lines 1-4).

In regard to dependent Claim 11, Claim 11 reflects the method of displaying a list of items in an electronic catalog as claimed in Claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

7. Claims 25-32, and 34-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo in view of Fohn et al. (hereinafter Fohn, U.S. Patent No. 6,014,639 filed 11/05/1997, issued 01/11/2000).

In regard to independent Claims 25 (and similarly independent Claims 36, and 42), Fohn teaches *searching an electronic catalog for items that meet a criteria identified in a received request and displaying a list of items identified in the search* (Col. 1, lines 53-65; Col. 2; Tables 1-3; teaches parametric searching of a product catalog whose results are listed as a series of tables, from which one can drill-down to specific information).

Fohn also teaches *receiving a selection of one of the displayed attributes* in that a user can interactively drill-down for more and more specific details on products through repeated selections, querying, and generating results (Col. 2, lines 16-67; Col. 3, lines 1-11).

Fohn fails to teach *consolidating at least two of the displayed items based on the selected attribute*; and *displaying the consolidated items as a single item*. However, Lo teaches such a limitation (see Fig. 11b). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Fohn and Lo as both inventions relate to tabular manipulations of data. Adding the teaching of Lo provides the benefit of minimizing the amount of table space being used to present products.

In regard to dependent Claim 26 (and similarly dependent Claims 37, and 43), Fohn fails to teach *displaying a count of the consolidated items that are displayed as a single item in association with the displayed single item*. However, Lo teaches that depending on the column data type (ASCII, Numeric, etc. . . .), the column value of the resultant row can contain, inter alia, the same value (if all the values in the original rows are the same), *or the same value plus a count (i.e., the number of value occurrences)*, NULL (indicating different values on the original rows), or a majority value (e.g., 8 of the 10 original values are the same) (Col. 5, lines 47-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Fohn and Lo as both inventions relate to tabular manipulations of data. Adding the teaching of Lo provides the benefit of minimizing the amount of table space being used to present products.

In regard to dependent Claim 27, Fohn fails to teach *displaying the values for a second attribute of the consolidated items by displaying a range for the attribute values*. However, Lo teaches that if a column is of a numeric data type, the column value of the resultant row can be the average value, the *range of values*, or the maximum/minimum

Art Unit: 2176

(Col. 5, lines 56-58; Figs. 8-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Fohn and Lo as both inventions relate to tabular manipulations of data. Adding the teaching of Lo provides the benefit of minimizing the amount of table space being used to present products.

In regard to dependent Claim 28 (and similarly dependent Claims 38, and 44), both Fohn and Lo fail to explicitly teach that *the processor further consolidates at least some of the displayed items including consolidated items based on a second attribute selection received from the user interface and provides the further consolidated items to be presented as single items on the display.* However, Lo does teach that a user may specify a user viewing preference to further modify the table display (Abstract).

Lo also teaches that the condensing of the table is dictated by metadata rules that describe a sequence of condensing procedures to be done to a table in order to prepare it for display on a given device (PDA, Laptop, etc.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to simply further condense the table described by Lo by adding additional metadata rules to those that already exist providing the benefit of creating a table that can fit on a device with a limited display. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Fohn and Lo as both inventions relate to tabular manipulations of data. Adding the teaching of Lo provides the benefit of minimizing the amount of table space being used to present products.

In regard to dependent Claim 29 (and similarly dependent Claims 39, and 45), Fohn fails to teach *consolidating comprises comparing the values for the selected attribute for at least some of the items and combining items that have the same value for the attribute into a single consolidated item*. However, Lo teaches such a limitation (see Fig. 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Fohn and Lo as both inventions relate to tabular manipulations of data. Adding the teaching of Lo provides the benefit of minimizing the amount of table space being used to present products.

In regard to dependent Claim 30 (and similarly dependent Claim 46), Fohn fails to teach *receiving a selection of a range of values*. However, Lo teaches that metadata is received by the proxy server in the form of table reduction rules (i.e., metadata) specific to the employee table of Fig. 8. The table reduction rules (901) can be generally into a default partition attribute (902) having an associated partition method and combination functions (903), both of which are required meta-data inputs for performing row reduction by the table summarizer module (233) of the proxy server (203) (Col. 9, lines 49-60).

Using this mechanism, Lo also teaches *consolidating at least some of the displayed items based on the selected attribute as a result of applying the table reduction rules*. More specifically, Lo teaches *comparing the values for the selected attribute for at least some of the items and combining items that have an attribute value within the selected range into a single consolidated item* in that if a column is of a numeric data type, the column value of the resultant row can be the average value, the

Art Unit: 2176

range of values, or the maximum/minimum (Col. 5, lines 56-58; Figs. 8-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Fohn and Lo as both inventions relate to tabular manipulations of data. Adding the teaching of Lo provides the benefit of minimizing the amount of table space being used to present products.

In regard to dependent Claim 31 (and similarly dependent Claims 40, and 47), Claim 31 (and similarly dependent Claims 40, and 47) reflects the method of displaying a list of items in an electronic catalog as claimed in Claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In addition, Fohn fails to teach *removing all of the items from the display except for the consolidated items*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to allow for this feature because it is notoriously well known in the art to deselect items in a listing that one is not interested in to simplify the display. This is especially true where a large number of items are involved.

In regard to dependent Claim 32, Claim 32 reflects the method of displaying a list of items in an electronic catalog as claimed in Claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale. It is similar to removing a row or column.

In regard to dependent Claim 34 (and similarly dependent Claim 41), Fohn fails to teach *receiving a selection of a category corresponding to at least one of the items; displaying values for the at least one item for attributes related specifically to items of the selected category; receiving a selection of a category specific attribute; and consolidating at least some of the displayed items of the selected category based on the*

selected attribute. However, Lo teaches that if a column is of a certain well-defined hierarchical semantic data type, the column value of the resultant row can be the common ancestor in the domain hierarchy. For example, in the case of an automobile hierarchy, if "gasoline powered" cars at one hierarchical level, are sub-grouped as "high-octane" and "low-octane" cars at a lower hierarchical level, then the resultant column value is represented simply as "gasoline powered" thereby removing the lower hierarchical distinction between high and low octane automobiles in the resultant row (Col. 5, lines 61-67; Col. 6, lines 1-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Fohn and Lo as both inventions relate to tabular manipulations of data. Adding the teaching of Lo provides the benefit of minimizing the amount of table space being used to present products.

In regard to dependent Claim 35, Fohn fails to teach *removing all of the items from the display except for items of the selected category*. However, Lo teaches that if a column is of a certain well-defined hierarchical semantic data type, the column value of the resultant row can be the common ancestor in the domain hierarchy. For example, in the case of an automobile hierarchy, if "gasoline powered" cars at one hierarchical level, are sub-grouped as "high-octane" and "low-octane" cars at a lower hierarchical level, then the resultant column value is represented simply as "gasoline powered" thereby removing the lower hierarchical distinction between high and low octane automobiles in the resultant row (Col. 5, lines 61-67; Col. 6, lines 1-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Fohn and Lo as both inventions relate to tabular manipulations of data. Adding the teaching of

Art Unit: 2176

Lo provides the benefit of minimizing the amount of table space being used to present products.

8. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fohn in view of Lo, and in further view of Bliss.

In regard to dependent Claim 33, neither Fohn nor Lo specifically teach *receiving a selection comprises receiving a selection through a user interface*. However, Bliss teaches such a user interface (see Figs. 2-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Fohn, Lo, and Bliss as all three inventions relate to table manipulations. Adding the teaching of Bliss allows one to alternatively collapse and expand tables to examine different levels of detail.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments, see amendment, filed 11/25/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-11, and 25-47 under Lo in view of Bliss have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Courter in combination with Lo and Bliss. Applicant argues that neither of the references contains any teaching or suggestion of an electronic catalog. The Examiner agrees, withdraws the rejection and has now applied the prior art of Courter, which suggests using a web version of an Excel spreadsheet to provide interactivity to web tables. The Examiner argues that such a feature applied to Lo teaches the limitation. The Examiner also notes that there were many examples of interactive tables at the time of the invention, further rendering the limitation obvious.

Applicant further argues that neither Lo nor Bliss teach that such interactivity could be performed once the table was created. The Examiner agrees and withdraws the rejection. Likewise however, the prior art of Courter does teach post-published interactive web tables, and in combination with Lo teaches that limitation. The Applicant also argues that neither Lo nor Bliss teaches other limitations found in Claim 1. The Examiner agrees, but argues that such features as deleting columns and rows are common to spreadsheet applications and Courter allows one to create interactive spreadsheets for the web with such features. The Examiner respectfully submits that other deficiencies in the prior art of Lo and Bliss are now responded to by the addition of

Art Unit: 2176

the Courter reference. In addition, the Examiner also adds the prior art of Fohn et al. to teach amended limitations in Claims 25-47.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

11. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
02/03/2006

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
2/5/2006